

**eRIM Steering Committee Minutes
for the State of Montana
January 24, 2007**

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Attendees | <p>The meeting was called to order at 9:15 a.m. Snowy roads and cold temperatures slowed down everyone's morning.</p> <p>Brad Johnson (SOS); Dick Clark (Admin-ITSD); Amy Carlson, (OBPP); Judy Meadows (State Law Library); Mark Van Alstyne (SOS-IT); Jodie Foley (MHS); Susan Fox (Legis Services); Tori Hunthausen (Legislative Audit); Laurie Lamson (DPHHS); Lois Menzies (Judicial); Darlene Staffeldt (State Library); Cheri Bergeron (OPI); Sandy Broesder and Sheryl Wood (MACo); Janice Doggett (SOS); Patti Borsberry (SOS); Pat Ingraham,(Representative); Jim Currie (Transportation).</p> |
| Opening Remarks | <p>Brad welcomed everyone. He reviewed the outcome of the last month's meeting and acknowledged the progress so far. He's impressed and confident we're off to a great start. He expressed appreciation; everyone is doing a great job and if we take into account our individual parts, we can avoid getting overwhelmed.</p> <p>Dick offered again, if we don't know where we're at or how we want to get there, that is why we are here. Today, we can discuss how we are going to get there.</p> <p>Patti mentioned that we may get done early today depending how we're able to work through the agenda. She also offered, for consideration to shorten the monthly meetings.</p> |
| Approval of Minutes | <p>Patti assisted the committee with understanding the design of the minutes; asking for everyone's attention and review of the minutes' attachments. Their content is significant enough, that if the committee agrees, they would be treated as individual documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attachment A: Mission/Roles/Statements (open discussion remarks) Attachment B: Who Are You? (stakeholders/roles) Attachment C: Stakeholders and Drivers Attachment D: Goals and Objectives (open discussion list) <p>Attachment B: describe agencies-State and Local Attachment C: the group asked for listing similar agencies together Tori and Susan agreed to leave Legislative Services areas separated. Jodie asked for MHS to have added: eDiscovery and Federal Regulations Laurie asked for DPHHS to have added: local government (contracting) Sheryl asked for: local gov to be added to Leg Services, DPHHS, and DOA.</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>Approval of Minutes (cont)</p> | <p>Patti will fix the Stakeholder and Drivers titles and commented that this report can also be sorted, by the agencies and their drivers, to help them identify their own RIM requirements, later.</p> <p>It was agreed these attachments will serve individually. Patti will make the requested changes. Each member is encouraged to keep these documents in mind; to add or remove items, through Patti, as necessary.</p> <p>Patti asked everyone to keep in mind Attachment D: Goals and Objectives as we move forward to address, meet, add or remove items.</p> <p>Discussion returned to the body of the minutes. Patti requested the committee revisit the draft Vision and Mission statements, in order to move for formal adoption. Pat asked what was meant by the last sentence; <i>choosing a defacto leader</i>; as it currently is the responsibility of the Secretary of State? Tori offered that the discussion, last month, was that this committee does not have the authority to make any decisions. Susan mentioned the question arose about who is going to serve as the leader. Laurie proposed taking that sentence out of the mission statement and place it on a future agenda as an action item. Patti proposed moving it to Attachment D-Goals and Objectives. All agreed. Jim stated it seems obvious that the SOS should be the leader.</p> <p>Jodie asked for records and information management and preservation to be added and it was done.</p> <p>Patti asked if there were any further oppositions or changes to either statement? Seeing none, but including the above mentioned changes, she called for official adoption. All in favor? All. Any opposed? None.</p> <p>The vision and mission statement were adopted, as revised: VISION STATEMENT <i>Propose recommendations in the area of records and information management; collaborating with the legal, information technology, preservation and business communities, which will balance the public's right to know and right to privacy interests.</i></p> <p>MISSION STATEMENT: <i>The eRIM Steering Committee serves the State of Montana in the adoption and recommended implementation of an electronic records and information management (eRIM) strategy supported by the records management, legal, information technology, business and preservation communities, to support public access; balanced with right to know and right to privacy; to create a framework for managing state and local government public records.</i></p> <p>Page one, paragraph two: Tori asked for a change of office name for Monica Huyg, who spoke last month. The office is the Legislative Audit Division, of</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Approval of Minutes (cont) | <p>which she serves as Legal Counsel.</p> <p>Patti asked if there were any further oppositions or changes to the minutes. Seeing none, but including the above mentioned changes, she called for motion to accept the minutes. Jodie motioned approval. Dick motioned a second. No one opposed and the minutes were adopted.</p> |
| Old Business | <p>Steering Committee Webpage Patti demonstrated the committee's webpage, located on the Secretary of State (SOS) website. It was opened with a welcoming paragraph and its associated links to the Resource Directory and Member Directory. On the resource page, Patti included the resources' associated links, if she had access to them. Brad stated he'd like to see a link on all items. Mark offered to help get this done. Anyone who would like to add items should send information to Patti, including links to national standards that are known with each of the stakeholders' communities (i.e., ASNI or ISO for records management. These should be utilized and will save the committee members time.</p> <p>Judy will send Patti the link to the Privacy and Public Access Rule and to the authenticity report written by American Association of Law Libraries. Question from Jodie: what about hard copy resources that could be shared? Members could add their list with title, name of person who has them and they could be shared. She commented that we can use what is important to Montana. It was agreed by the group and anyone can submit those to Patti. Publications and documents will all be posted in .pdf format. Patti thanked Mark, and his staff, for getting this done.</p> <p>Controlled Vocabulary Patti would like to come back to this later in the day. She believes several persons should pool together to work on this.</p> <p>Other States Reports Patti has not had a lot of success finding states who've tackled content management. She is currently waiting on a call from Kansas, based on a grant application she found on the internet. Dick offered to try to get a hold of the Kansas CIO for enterprise management. Patti finds that most states have a records management policy or procedures and is currently reviewing Florida's. Utah and Arizona are front-runners in preservation. Patti mentioned what the attendees of the COOP (continuity of operations) training were told; there's only one way to eat an elephant.....and that is one bite at a time. She offered to show the group a summary of what she's found. Dick mentioned this group needs to find out other states' funding, their time spent/timetable and what states are using and etc. Patti will continue her research.</p> <p>Pat expressed interest in the grants and asked if there is money for counties? Sometimes these changes take place and it impacts their people (local</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <p>Old Business (cont)</p> | <p>governments). Patti reported that right now there is CoSA (Council of State Archivists) funding, worth about 2.6 million dollars, being put towards education (i.e., webinars) to focus on long-term preservation of and access to local government records. It is being supported by a two-year grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). Jodie stated there is going to be money for each state: http://www.statearchivists.org/lga/LGATF-ExecSumm-2008-01.pdf).</p> <p>Dick felt this won't just be one time monies and that the grants will be spread out and will go down to the locals as well. At the end of the day, locals will have a lot of these same responsibilities. Patti responded with that is why we want the local governments represented.</p> <p>Action Items Report Patti reported that as agreed during the December meeting, she, Dick and Mike met to discuss and comprise proposed action items, based on the five action items that the committee had identified; access, security, education, compliance and preservation. However, during discussions it became apparent that these five items are more closely related to community requirements (that do need to be met), but not the high-level strategies that this group should concentrate on.</p> <p>Dick and Patti, and on behalf of Mike B, proposed the group review and consider instead the Action Items document (see attachment E), which stands as an individual document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ a comprehensive, strategic analysis providing enterprise benchmarking; ✚ statute and administrative rule review; ✚ proposed “legislative package” for the 2009-2010 EPP process and 2009 session; ✚ marketing and awareness. <p>Action Items Report - Strategic Planning and Benchmarking Patti and Dick went over the Action Items document, explaining that they felt it necessary to add benchmarking to this item. Jeff Sillick, MDT Business Operations Manager, accompanied Mike to the first action item meeting. During the meeting, he mentioned that MDT had taken the Risk Profiler-Self Assessment for Records and Information Management, offered through ARMA International (association of records managers and administrators). This assessment rates whether an entity's RIM program is an asset or liability (http://www.arma.org/profiler/RIMAssessment.cfm).</p> <p>Dick voiced that the best thing we can do is benchmark what we are doing and that he believes that this is the best route to take and then consider bringing in an outside person, at the end of the assessments we look at the benchmarks, having the ability to say that we have x-number of agencies falling into x-categories. Then we would know how big the issue is. He believes the locals</p> |
|--------------------------------|---|

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <p>Old Business (cont)</p> | <p>need to do this as well due to the big differences between small and large counties. From our point of view this bench marking is critical.</p> <p>Lois asked about the details of the ARMA assessments. Patti stated it is done on-line, takes several hours to complete (but does not need to be completed in one setting) and that it should be done by an agency team. Patti will help any agency who is willing to take this. It is cheaper by several hundred dollars, if you are an ARMA member (\$395 if a member and \$795, if not). Agencies can become a member for the next year and receive the lesser cost for the assessment, plus take advantage of the other benefits, such as the four meetings a month, with one being a two-day conference with fantastic speakers. There is an international site and big sky chapter site, for anyone interested (arma.org or bigskyarma.org)</p> <p>Brad asked how long it takes for the results turnaround. Patti offered to find out. Brad recommended picking a handful of agencies first, before going enterprise wide. Patti agreed, stating a “sampling” of agencies may be sufficient enough and maybe we won’t need everyone.</p> <p>Dick suggested working with a coalition of the willing. If we can get some of the bigger agencies done, we will know where we are at. Pat felt this would be a good beginning, and some counties operate by their bylaws, but also have to come up with own way to store. But what you find at the state level, probably all 56 counties will have same problems. She asked, from the outcome, are we going to establish laws and rules; keeping in mind that each county has different problems? Dick responded that would be the goal.</p> <p>Dick offered Administration to take the assessment and he will pay to have this done. Jim encouraged including a small agency. Patti can work on this. Jodie asked if there is any funding that we could pull together to get this done? Brad responded that if push comes to shove, if the only thing that stands in the way is money then we can find a way to deal with this. It was also agreed to have one or two counties do this, small, medium and large agency, if money available.</p> <p>Darlene asked, if the assessments come out with a weak report what are we going to gain from these agencies? Jodie offered that we’ll have the documentation needed to plan. Brad mentioned that to have agencies take the same test doesn’t mean their outcome would be the same.</p> <p>Susan asked who ARMA is “aimed” at, such as private or public? Patti stated they serve both, offering universal educational training and materials, but they also provide industry-specific initiatives. Susan asked if the assessments can be rated against other governments? Patti offered to find out.</p> <p>Judy thought the states’ requirements will be even higher then private sector requirements. Pat stated this would give us a step ahead if we know how we</p> |
|--------------------------------|---|

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <p>Old Business (cont)</p> | <p>are going to use the information once we get it. What is it going to tell us? Dick offered that we all need to think ahead so that once the test is done we would then know what we are going to work on and seek funding. Jodie pointed out this will be a helpful tool to know how to train agencies in areas they need most help all exams are a learning experience. Brad declared we need to define our starting point, magnitude and scope; before we ask for money. Patti mentioned that with the State's records center needs, that maybe this would also help look at that and support the needs. Dick reiterated that it is spooky that the Center resides right next to the railroad tracks and, again, we're going to have to pick and choose what to tackle first. Jodie offered this can be public relations, to use, also. Pat commented, perhaps we are doing better than we think. Sandy would like to pull together a small committee and have this taken using it as a learning tool, how to prioritize and what bites should be taken. The weakest area is having the resources to give at this time.</p> <p>With all comments considered, the group looked at the MDT rating/score card, the elements and suggested proposals for improvement. Patti was also asked to find out if there is a MT sample.</p> <p>Jodie offered, once gathered, would give an archivist to help with training etc.</p> <p>Cheri asked who belongs on the (assessment) team. Patti suggested the agency's records custodians, legal counsel, business managers and IT staff? She offered to check with MDT to find out who partook on theirs and let Cheri know.</p> <p>The following agencies offered to move forward: MACo, DOA, OPI, ITSD, State Library, Legislative and Judicial branches, HHS and SOS.</p> <p>Action Items Report - Assessment of Statutes</p> <p>Patti checked with Chris to see what the results were from the monthly Legal Council's meeting. Chris carried the request to see if there would be interest in studying which RIM statutes are affecting legal. And, although he didn't gather commitment, there is interest, from this council, to support this review.</p> <p>Patti stated that the SOS' office needs to write rules that will define what is a long term record, what or when to archive and what methods to use for preservation</p> <p>Pat asked; when we are looking at this state statute that we are required to microfilm for back up, maybe looking at other options that met preservation? Patti, microfilm is still the national archive standard today. Shelf life for film is 100 years. Moving toward an electronic world, there are no standards or procedures for electronic records. Some records still need to be on film.</p> <p>Dick mentioned that Chris was pretty clear on statutes. He can go to each agency lawyer and be told what problems they are having. Patti repeated what</p> |
|--------------------------------|---|

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <p>Old Business (cont)</p> | <p>Chris stated; the goal is not to change statutes, it is to see what needs to be changed. Jodie stated that the communities need “teeth” in the statutes. We all need them to say “you must” or “one has to”....</p> <p>Action Items Report - Proposed Legislative Package Dick stated that if we can identify what we need, such as we’ve talked in the short run about email and discovery and that we could use that pretty soon in business and how much it would help with discovery. All lawyers would think this is a good investment.</p> <p>This is a matter of trying to put in EPP markers for the budget office, for eRIM. He’s not sure what it looks like, this warrants more discussion; but what do we want to try for, this time or next, maybe start with the administrative rules first? During the Action Items document review Dick, Susan and Chris felt we don’t need to know specifics, but to have the markers in place for funding.</p> <p>Pat asked what is the EPP? Susan explained it’s the <u>Executive Planning Process</u> that agencies goes through to submit their biennial budgets to the Governor’s Office, then on to the legislature. For budgeting, by May 1, agencies have to have their new budget proposals in place and into the governor’s office. Jodie asked if this marker will be for DOA, itself. Dick replied this will be enterprise wide request. If we do it once, we can use it as a share tool for all.</p> <p>Amy added that the Governor’s Office does not see general fund money in excess at all; whatever an agency comes up with is going to need to be as efficient as possible. The economy is not where it was; and is not going to be where it was. Going enterprise would make the most sense to do. This will be a very tight session with very little money available. Lois asked if the Governor’s Office has let agencies know of a target amount. Amy let her know this will be done in February.</p> <p>Action Items Report - Marketing and Awareness Dick feels strongly that everyone needs to be outward when talking to people. Talk to your professional organizations, commissioners, legislators; it never hurts; always need to be informing; have our case laid out.</p> <p>Sheryl mentioned that MACo is having their annual meeting February 14th in Billings and she’ll be talking about this issue.</p> <p>Patti let the group know that the Local Government Records Committee (LGRC), is addressing how to get back to these annual conferences and notify them of our actions and have them update schedules and procedures to reflect eRIM; retention schedules could use revision.</p> |
|--------------------------------|--|

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Old Business (cont) | <p>Jodie stated that a really good model is the CoSA. They put together the templates and all anyone has to do is put in their own information. We could prepare many things ahead of time so that all we would have to do is add info and then use. Could be on web site where anyone would be able to get to them and use.</p> <p>The SOS-RIM office currently provides a RIM 101 training that covers the state required forms for retention compliance. However, everyone is required to take care of their records. After completing the COOP training, we're prioritizing vital records protection. Further recommendations need consideration.</p> <p>After review of the document, Patti asked the committee if they feel this addresses the avenues to pursue. Everyone approved.</p> <p>Jodie proposed subcommittees be formed to address these initiatives and report back to the eRIM committee each month. Everyone agreed. Laurie proposed that the committees, via their chairperson, work on proposed legislative package items</p> <p>Patti asked for a formal motion to adopt subcommittees. All in favor? All. Any opposed? None.</p> |
| New Business | <p>eRIM Subcommittees Chosen</p> <p>Strategic Planning and Benchmarking Subcommittee</p> <p>Dick, Brad, Patti and Jodie will work on this.</p> <p>Dick stated this group needs to take a look, from a high-level approach, spread over a number of sessions, via strategic planning and phased (long-range) approach.</p> <p>Statute and Rule Review Subcommittee</p> <p>Again, it is hoped that Chris will chair this subcommittee and be able to rely on other counsel to identify the needs and requirements of this committee. Janice offered to serve. Judy did also, as she's involved with statute and administrative rule review. MACo should be involved plus, consideration of other local government counsel.</p> <p>This subcommittee should also take a high-level approach, spread across multiple sessions, in an attempt to update regulations to include eRIM, where necessary.</p> <p>Mark asked Dick if these will roll up into the state strategic plan? Yes. Laurie mentioned they are also doing the same thing and if information can be used at a higher level that would be good. Jodie stated these could be used as case studies. Patti: they could be used as models, find out how they procure funding?</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <p>New Business (cont)</p> | <p>Legislative Proposals and EPP Planning Committee agreed with Dick that we're not ready for a concrete package. Susan commented that the legislative package be part of the state's plan. She encouraged creating definitions.</p> <p>When addressed, considerations must include: Multi sessions Draft strategy Components/concepts End goal Actions</p> <p>Marketing and Awareness Lois offered to chair this subcommittee. Laurie offered to serve, but can not start until February. Mike was volunteered by Dick. Ideas for this group included: DPHHS: education with other agencies, outreach to counties and cities. Judy: begin working with every agency's records person. (MCA 2-6-213 (6). Patti commented that she is going to start picking up record custodian meetings, again, and that Mark Sullivan, DOR Custodian, is willing to organize and facilitate these meetings. Sandra is willing to help with local government.</p> <p>Dick will talk to the cabinet that things are moving for RIM; anytime something is done he will take it to cabinet. He recommends a handout to keep executive staff's informed. He also mentioned web "passive marketing" such as charging for information that other states or sites like Google use.</p> <p>Upcoming events are great for active marketing, along with newsletters whether agency specific or professional communities. The SOS-RIM site is a good place for this. For local governments; get with their associations, conventions or meetings. Pick people from this group to speak. Address Legislative Committees and keep them aware. Jodie mentioned creating quick materials that everyone could use.</p> <p>Standardized Vocabulary Subcommittee (quasi) Within our own professional communities there are glossaries available. Patti recommended we form a quasi-subcommittee and work on definitions. Patti, Jodie, Randy Holm, Darlene and Susan (offered). Judy Meadows offered to see if they have one. Jodie mentioned that Susan suggested someone for legal language definitions.</p> |
| <p>Other Business</p> | <p>FEMA/NARA COOP Training Patti stated the training was great, heightens continuity awareness, was well attended by General Services, IT, Records Mgmt, local gov and other staff. The goal for this training was to "train the trainers" enabling state and local</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Other Business (cont) | <p>Government, to carry this further. There are federal toolkits available for state and local governments. The training is all about managing continuity of business during an event (of whatever type), identifying essential functions and vital records necessary to bring business back up and running, needs, such as technology and data, off-site or additional buildings, employees rosters, etc. People at her table where from the HHS lab where they deal with environmental and other bio-hazards. SOS-RIM and ITSD-Continuity Bureau are going to try to bring back Kathy Arntz, NARA, to Montana and offer a workshop on vital records identification and protection.</p> <p>Patti brought up the discussion of holding shorter meetings. After taking comments, it was agreed by the group to try 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. and disregard lunches. We'll take two morning breaks.</p> |
| Next Meeting | Everyone is reminded that the next meeting will be held on February 20, 2008, Room 172, in the State Capital. |
| Adjourn | <p>The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Connie Rigney SOS-RIM Program Specialist</p> |